

DUMBARTON OAKS

The Armenian Chronicle of the Constable Smpad or of the "Royal Historian"

Author(s): Sirarpie der Nersessian

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, Vol. 13 (1959), pp. 141+143-168

Published by: [Dumbarton Oaks, Trustees for Harvard University](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1291131>

Accessed: 21/01/2013 13:05

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Dumbarton Oaks, Trustees for Harvard University is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE ARMENIAN CHRONICLE OF THE
CONSTABLE SMPAD OR OF
THE “ROYAL HISTORIAN”

SIRARPIE DER NERSESSIAN

THE Chronicle written by the Constable Smpad (1208–1276), brother of King Het'um of Cilicia, is one of the principal Armenian sources for the history of the Crusades.¹ The section of it which extends from the year 951 to 1162 follows mainly the History of Matthew of Edessa and of his continuator Gregory the Priest, occasionally including information derived from other sources; it is, on the other hand, particularly important for the history of the thirteenth century, since it was written by a man who had direct access to the official documents and who, moreover, played a major role in many of the events he related. An anonymous writer continued the Chronicle down to the year 1331.

The two Armenian editions, one published in Moscow in 1856 by Osgan of Erivan, the other in Paris in 1859 by G. Chahnazarian, have long been out of print. In 1862 V. Langlois published a French translation of certain sections only;² in 1869, the greater part of the text, beginning with the year 1092, was included by E. Dulaurier, together with a French translation, in the *Recueil des historiens des Croisades*.³

All of these publications were based on two manuscripts of fairly late date in the Library of Etchmiadzin and on copies of them made towards the middle of the nineteenth century. The new Armenian edition, recently published by Father Seropé Akelian, deserves, therefore, special attention.⁴ It is based on a manuscript of the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century which had been bought in Constantinople in 1876 by Seropé Markar Alishan and given to his elder brother, Father Leonce Alishan, who deposited it in the Library of San Lazzaro (no. 1308).⁵ There are several *lacunae* in this manuscript. The initial folios, relating the events of the years 951 to 974, are lost and the manuscript is also incomplete at the end, where it stops abruptly in the middle of an account of the events of the year 1272; the other missing parts occur after folios 11, 35, 45, and 156 (A.D. 1023–1029, 1063–1064, 1070, 1230–1251). In order to present a continuous text, the editor has copied the missing parts from the Paris edition of Smpad's Chronicle and in one instance from the History of Matthew of Edessa, clearly indicating these additions through the use of smaller type.⁶

Unfortunately, this new publication is not a critical edition. There are frequent references in the footnotes to the corresponding passages of Matthew

¹ In transliterating Armenian names I have followed the pronunciation of the Western Armenians for all names of the Cilician period, since by that time the change in the consonant sounds had taken place.

² Victor Langlois, *Chronique de Sempad, Extraits* (St. Petersburg, 1862).

³ *Documents arméniens*, I, pp. 610–72.

⁴ S. Akelian, *Smpada Sbarabedi Darekirk' (Chronicle of the Constable Smpad)*. (Venice-San Lazzaro, 1956).

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. ix–x.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 1–11, 27, 59, and 226–8 are taken from Smpad's Chronicle; pp. 71–4 are taken from the *History of Matthew of Edessa* (Vagharshabad, 1898), pp. 194–7.

of Edessa and occasional references to those of the Chronicle of Samuel of Ani, but in rare instances only is the text compared with that of the earlier editions of Smpad's Chronicle. This is particularly regrettable because of the many important differences, and the reader who does not himself make this comparison remains unaware of the particular significance of the manuscript on which the new edition is based, and of the new information that it provides.

Ever since the late nineteenth century, when L. Alishan published his important study on the Kingdom of Cilicia, translated into French a few years later,⁷ it has been known that there existed in the Library of San-Lazzaro a manuscript that contained a more detailed text than did Smpad's Chronicle known through the editions of Moscow and Paris. Alishan referred to this as the work of the Royal historian, or as the Cilician Chronicle; he quoted numerous passages from it in his *Sissouan* and published several extracts in his collection of texts entitled *Hayabadoum*.⁸ Historians of the Middle Ages and of the Crusades, in particular Claude Cahen, have made frequent use of the passages known to them through the French translations of Alishan's works;⁹ and in 1948 the late Robert P. Blake read a paper at the Byzantine Congress in Paris entitled "La chronique royale de la Cilicie arménienne." Through the courtesy of the Abbot of San Lazzaro Blake had obtained a complete microfilm of this manuscript, but the rights to publish the text had been reserved for the Mekhitharist Congregation. It is most surprising, therefore, that in this new edition, made by one of the Mekhitharist Fathers, there is no indication that the manuscript used is the very one referred to by Blake, in other words, Alishan's "Royal Chronicle."

That this is the case is beyond doubt. One need only collate the quotations in the Armenian edition of *Sissouan* and the extracts included in *Hayabadoum* with the corresponding passages in the new edition to be convinced that they are taken from the same manuscript.¹⁰ It is this identity that makes the new publication particularly valuable, for we now have the long-awaited text of the "Royal Chronicle" and can compare it with the editions of Smpad's Chronicle.

Such a comparison shows clearly that the text of the Etchmiadzin manuscripts of the Chronicle, known through the Moscow and Paris editions, is an abbreviation of the text of the Venice manuscript. This abbreviation, which may be the work of the continuator of the Chronicle or of a later scribe, was

⁷ *Léon le Magnifique, premier roi de Sissouan ou de l'Arménocilicie*, écrit par le R. P Léonce M. Alishan, traduit par le R. P. George Bayan (Venice-San Lazzaro, 1888). Léonce Alishan, *Sissouan ou l'Arménocilicie* (Venice-San Lazzaro, 1899).

⁸ L. Alishan, *Hayabadoum*, (Venice-San Lazzaro, 1901), pp. 412, 436-41.

⁹ Cl. Cahen, "Quelques textes négligés concernant les Turcomans de Rûm au moment de l'invasion mongole," *Byzantion*, 14 (1939), pp. 131-9; see especially 133-5. *Idem*, *La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des Croisades et la principauté franque d'Antioche* (Paris, 1940), *passim*. See his bibliography, p. 99: "Aussi officiel et plus circonstancié [than Smpad's Chronicle] est l'*Historien Royal* de l'extrême fin du XIII^e siècle qui n'est connu jusqu'ici que par les extraits d'Alishan dans 'Léon le Magnifique' et 'Sissouan,' extraits qui donnent l'impression d'un ouvrage considérable et rendent extrêmement désirable une édition." Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, II (Cambridge, 1952), pp. 483-4 and *passim*.

¹⁰ Compare in particular Alishan, *Hayabadoum*, pp. 412, 436-41 with Akelian, *op. cit.*, pp. 194, 200, 203-4, 206-7, 208-11. I have also had the advantage of having at my disposal the photographs made for Robert P. Blake.

carried out in a very uneven manner. Sometimes the events of a single year are told in fairly great detail, closely following the text of the Venice manuscript, but in numerous instances the long accounts of the latter are reduced to a few sentences or even entirely omitted, so that concerning several successive years there is no information at all.

The basic agreement between the two redactions becomes even more apparent when they are compared with the History of Matthew of Edessa, for in several instances they include events that are not recorded by the latter.¹¹ There are, however, a few minor additions in the text of the Etchmiadzin manuscripts,¹² and some of these must be considered more closely in order to determine whether the Venice manuscript contains the work of an anonymous writer, as Alishan was inclined to think,¹³ or whether it is a more faithful copy of Smpad's Chronicle.

Since the Venice manuscript is defective at the beginning and at the end, it does not give the name of the author which might either have accompanied the title of the work or have been mentioned in the colophon. Throughout the text the third person is used in all the references to Smpad. In the Etchmiadzin manuscripts, on the other hand, there are five distinct references to Smpad as the author. The first of these specific references is included in the praise of King Leon I, where it is stated that whenever this King heard of a man who was wise, learned, or expert in warfare, he attracted him to his court, "and I, the Constable Smpad, author of this history, am one of these men."¹⁴ Under the year 1208 we read: "The Constable Smpad, author of this book, was born in this year."¹⁵ In relating the Seljuk invasion of 1246 the author writes: "The father of the King and I, the Constable Smpad, entered Tarsus."¹⁶ Under the years 1248 and 1250 the brief entries read: "I, the Constable Smpad went to the Tartars. And I came back to my brother, King Het'um."¹⁷

Are these sentences part of the original redaction or are they later additions? The last three entries occur in a part of the text where there is a serious *lacuna* in the Venice manuscript. Ten folios following folio 156 are now lost and the missing text must have been at least five times as long as that preserved in the Etchmiadzin manuscripts. This is particularly regrettable since the lost narrative may have given more detailed information about Smpad's mission to the Mongol court than do his remarks in his letter to his brother-in-law, Henry I of Cyprus.¹⁸ The date of Smpad's departure on this mission, as given

¹¹ For instance, the events of the years 1129 to 1135; Akelian, *op. cit.*, pp. 159-60; *Recueil des historiens des Croisades, Doc. arm.*, I, pp. 615-6.

¹² For instance, after the account of the murder of the sons of Mandale and the return of T'oros to Vahga, the Etchmiadzin manuscripts give the following sentence which occurs neither in Matthew of Edessa (*RHC, Doc. arm.*, I, p. 100) nor in the Venice manuscript (Akelian, *op. cit.*, p. 137): "He established the inhabitants of the fortress on the banks of the river Baradis, in the locality now called Gragga (*RHC, Doc. arm.*, I, p. 613).

¹³ Alishan, *Hayabadoum*, pp. 111-2.

¹⁴ *RHC, Doc. arm.*, I, p. 634.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 643.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 650.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 651.

¹⁸ William of Nangis, "Vie de saint Louis," *Recueil des historiens de la France*, XX, pp. 361-3; L. Alishan, *Assises d'Antioche* (Venice, 1876), pp. 90-1.

in the Etchmiadzin manuscripts, is not correct. The Armenian year 697 began in January 1248; Smpad's letter was written from Samarkand on February 6, 1248, when he had been gone for eight months, and as P. Pelliot has shown, he must have set out on his journey the previous year, that is in 696 = A.D. 1247.¹⁹ This error in the date could not have been made by Smpad himself and must have originated in a later copy, as did so many other erroneous dates in the Etchmiadzin manuscripts.

In regard to the first autobiographic mention, it should be recalled that Smpad was only eleven years old when King Leon I died and it does not seem very likely that he would have referred to himself as one of the "men" who attracted the King's attention because of their wisdom, knowledge, or proficiency in warfare. Even the use of the first person in relating the Seljuk invasion of 1246 bears the stamp of an interpolation, for in the preceding paragraphs the third person had been used twice in relating the invasion of the previous year.²⁰

If we now turn to the content of the two redactions, we observe that in the Etchmiadzin manuscript the most summary treatment occurs in the latter part of the text, which extends from 1248 to 1275. Several years are entirely omitted, and the entries for the others consist of brief mentions, the longest being of only four sentences.²¹ In the Venice manuscript on the other hand, the account of the events of the years 1252 to 1272 (following the *lacuna* after folio 156 mentioned above) covers forty-seven pages.²² It is very difficult to suppose that a man who was interested in writing the history of his country would have so drastically curtailed the account of the period with which he was most familiar, and in which he had played a leading role. We must, therefore, conclude that Smpad is the author of the "Royal Chronicle" and that his text has been faithfully preserved in the Venice manuscript, while the other redaction, known through the Etchmiadzin manuscripts, is a faulty, abridged copy, with a few additions of a later date.

Smpad's Chronicle, as we now see it, was a homogeneous composition. The first part is primarily a summary of the History of Matthew of Edessa, as mentioned above. Very few facts have been omitted; but Smpad has condensed the verbose descriptions of his source. He has, moreover, eliminated the long speeches as well as the frequent references to the Scriptures. He has greatly abridged, too, the passages relating to Matthew's native city of Edessa,²³ but it is evident that he also used other sources. For instance, in speaking of the arrival of the Crusaders, he recalls the predication of Peter the Hermit, not mentioned by Matthew of Edessa, and instead of listing the names of the principal

¹⁹ P. Pelliot, "Les Mongols et la Papauté," *Revue de l'Orient chrétien*, XXIV (1924), pp. 326-7 and XXVIII (1931-1932) pp. 18-9. In the Chronicle of Het'um (Hayton) of Gorigos, which has now been published for the first time, the date of Smpad's journey is given as 1246. See V. A. Akopian, *Manv jamanakagrout' younner*, XIII-XVIIIc, II (Erevan, 1956), p. 67.

²⁰ *RHC, Doc. arm.*, I, p. 649.

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 651-3.

²² Folios 157-79v. Akelian, *op. cit.*, pp. 229-54.

²³ Note, for instance, the omission of the long letter which the Catholicos Gregory is said to have written to the clergy of Edessa: *RHC, Doc. arm.* I, pp. 63-7; Akelian, *op. cit.*, p. 121.

Crusaders he writes: "their complete history and the names of the princes are recorded by the Frank historians."²⁴ In several other instances also, Smpad's account, though shorter, contains specific information lacking in Matthew of Edessa.²⁵

Smpad follows less closely the text of Gregory the Priest, the continuator of Matthew of Edessa. The order of events is not always the same and Smpad is often better informed than Gregory. The Chronicle is particularly valuable for the period from 1163 to 1273, and since this section has been so badly preserved in the later redaction, I propose to offer, for the convenience of historians of the Middle Ages who are not familiar with the Armenian language, a comparison of the two redactions and a translation of those passages which are not restricted to the local history of Cilicia. But before beginning this comparison, I shall translate the account of Manuel's entry into Antioch in 1159, which does not occur in the later redaction, and which also differs in many respects from the account given by Gregory the Priest.²⁶

Smpad first speaks of the arrival of Manuel in Cilicia, tells how the Emperor forgave T'oros, thanks to the good offices of the King of Jerusalem and other, Latin princes, and adds:

"Then the King of Jerusalem, the Prince of Antioch, the sebastos T'oros and the Frères thought of saving the Christians and, setting out in great numbers, they came and encamped before Antioch. But, although the King of Jerusalem and all the leaders exhorted the Emperor of the Greeks to hasten to the salvation of the Christians, and he agreed to do this and gave them his promise, yet he did not do so truthfully and sincerely. For he intended to enter Antioch not for a useful purpose but for debauchery and lust for women; he had thought of marrying one of the daughters of Bohemond, Lord of Antioch, and he wanted to go to see her and find out whether he liked her, but he did not betray his thoughts to anyone. And during these days he gave very handsome presents to Baldwin, the King of Jerusalem, who was a very tall man and most pious; he crowned him with the royal diadem and gave him costly garments; he prepared a royal palace which he filled with all kinds of gold and silver vessels, and furniture, as is the custom, and presented that to him.²⁷ He also offered costly gifts to the latter's princes, and one of these princes, named Philip, spoke words worthy of remembrance. When the Emperor sent him three talents of gold and costly garments, he arose, thanked and praised the King, and said to the messengers: 'Tell your King that we have not come to you for

²⁴ Akelian, *op. cit.*, p. 100. Here the name of Peter the Hermit is given as Peter-Sarkis, but in the manuscript itself Peter is added in the margin, as a correction of the name Sarkis, written by mistake in the text.

²⁵ There are also instances where Smpad's text is more detailed; see, for instance, his account of the negotiations between an armorer called George and Bohemond in 1099, before the former opened the city of Antioch to the Crusaders (Akelian, *op. cit.*, pp. 106-8).

²⁶ Akelian, *op. cit.*, pp. 179-83. For Gregory the Priest see *RHC, Doc. arm.* I, pp. 188-93.

²⁷ William of Tyre (XVIII.24) also refers to the costly gifts presented by Manuel to Baldwin and to his followers.

treasures and garments, but for the salvation of the Christians. If you have this in mind and accomplish it, we shall place at your service our own selves, all our soldiers and all our belongings, and wherever fighting occurs you will see what brave soldiers you have. Give your gold to your poor. But if you should not do what we request and what you have promised, that is, the salvation of the Christians, then your gold is of no use to us.' Then they began to make the following arrangements for entering the city. They decorated the gates of the city and all the ramparts, they sent the royal banner to be raised on the fort, they placed the soldiers and their leaders to man the gates of the city and the streets, they established head-men for the streets and filled the entire city with soldiers. Then they sounded the trumpets, and the Emperor wearing imperial garments and, on his head, a crown adorned with precious stones which shone like the glittering stars, came forth on a horse harnessed in gold. On the Emperor's right and left the soldiers walked with measured tread. Before him rode the King of Jerusalem crowned with a diadem and seated on a horse, while the Lord of Antioch, to show his humility, preceded him on foot. And with such splendid pomp did Manuel, the Emperor of the Greeks, and Baldwin, the King of Jerusalem, enter the city of Antioch. The Emperor then proceeded to the center of the city and came to worship at the holy church and apostolic throne of Saint Peter; then he returned to his house.²⁸ When the great Emir of Aleppo, Nur ed-Din, son of Zengi, heard of this assembly of Christian Kings, he was dismayed; in his fear he equipped all his fortresses, prepared for battle, placed commanders in all places and conveyed his goods and plunder to the other side of the Euphrates river.²⁹ Then, after a few days, the Emperor sent an ambassador to Nur ed-Din; he wrote him a missive demanding all the land of the province of Antioch, Edessa, and its surrounding area which Nur ed-Din had wrested from the Christians, and also requested the return of the men of Christian nations who were held captive in the prisons. When the great Emir of Aleppo saw the ambassador and read the missive of the Emperor, he ceased to be troubled and afraid, for being a shrewd and wise man he realized how limited was the strength of the army; for this demand had not been made with sword and arrows, but with paper and ink. He answered, therefore, that he would not comply with the order and would never do these things that were asked of him, but that if he [the Emperor] was able, let him obtain them by force. Upon hearing this, the Emperor summoned everyone to advise him as to what he should answer. Then the King of Jerusalem, the Lord of Antioch, and all the princes fell at the feet

²⁸ The triumphal entry of Manuel into Antioch is related by William of Tyre (XVIII.25), by Nicetas Choniates (III.3) and especially by John Cinnamus (IV.21). See also F. Chalandon, *Jean II Comnène et Manuel I Comnène* (Paris, 1912), pp. 450-2.

²⁹ The joint expedition of the Byzantines and the Franks, which advanced only as far as Balana, mentioned by Gregory the Priest (*RHC, Doc. arm.*, I, p. 189), is only hinted at by Smpad, but he knew that Nur ed-Din had prepared to withstand the allied attack. For an account of these events see also Abu Shama, "Book of the Two Gardens," *RHC, Doc. or.*, IV, pp. 104-5.

of Manuel, Emperor of the Greeks, and said, 'O King, do not turn our great joy to sadness, for the enemies of Christ are in consternation because of our union, and if you should not fight them, but establish friendship with them, they will eradicate the name of the Christians from the face of the earth, they will despise and have no esteem for the Christian nations, and we shall become the target of their mockery.' But he [Manuel] alleged important reasons, saying: 'News has come from my capital and because of this I must hurry back,' and with false words he fabricated justifications for his return. Then all were greatly saddened and urgently pleaded with him to march on Aleppo, were it only for three days, and then, if he so wished, to establish friendship with its people. But Manuel did not listen to their pleas and was not willing to help the Christians; so he sent a friendly word to Nur ed-Din. When the infidels heard this, they were amazed by this unhopd-for occurrence, for all had expected to be destroyed, and now they saw that without bloodshed and war they were saved from ruin, and in their joy they could not believe that this was true and did not know what answer to give. They thought that the legates were spies sent to them, until they ascertained the truth from them, and when they had learned the truth, they sent to him [Manuel] many treasures and costly presents, fine horses and mules, and fifty of the Christian prisoners.³⁰ Then the good Emperor of the Greeks, Manuel, who had come like a powerful eagle, returned like a weak fox, and with his numerous cavalry he departed like a fugitive and reached the land of the Sultan Kiliç Arslan. Then the Turcomans, coming out of the border region,³¹ fell on the rearguard and slaughtered 12,000 men. Because of this there was great enmity between the Emperor and the Sultan, and T'oros was left in peace."

I shall now pass on to the comparison between the two redactions of Smpad's Chronicle and list below the events lacking in the later one. The initial figures give the pages of the new edition, those in brackets refer to the pages in the first volume of the *Documents arméniens* in *RHC*.

Pp. 188-9 (p. 623), A.D. 1167. Further information on the Catholicos Nerses the Gracious and remarks on the embassy of the Byzantine legate Theorianos.

Pp. 190-1 (p. 625), A.D. 1173. Information on Nerses' successor, his nephew Gregory. Mention of the death of Nur ed-Din and the accession of his son Malik as-Salih.

P. 192 (p. 625), A.D. 1175. Rupen seizes Msis, as well as Adana and Tarsus.

P. 194 (p. 628), A.D. 1187. Praise of the Baron Leon.

Pp. 194-200, A.D. 1187. Long account of the battle of Hattin and the fall

³⁰ According to Abu Shama it was Manuel who sent gifts to Nur ed-Din (*op. cit.*, p. 105). The small number of prisoners, mentioned by Smpad, must refer to the leaders; Cinnamus speaks of 6,000 men (IV.21), while Gregory the Priest writes that 10,000 prisoners were freed, which seems a gross exaggeration (*op. cit.*, p. 190).

³¹ Smpad uses here the Turkish word *uç*, which means "extremity" or "tip," and was applied by the Seljuks to the border lands especially. I am indebted to Mr. H. Berberian for this explanation.

of Jerusalem, entirely omitted in the later redaction, except for a short entry under the year 1188: "The sultan Saladin took Jerusalem from the Christians" (p. 629). Following is a translation of the original passage:

"At this time [A.D. 1187] the lord of Aleppo, Damascus, and Egypt was Husep', son of Ayub, called Salaheddin. There were two brothers, from the province of Dvin, the sons of a Kurdish peasant called Ayub; the name of the first son was Husep', that of the other was Hedl. They had come from their country for the purpose of drinking wine and had become the vassals of Nur ed-Din, the Lord of Aleppo, who, taking pity on them, occasionally gave them alms, and they served him faithfully. As their fortunes rose day by day they acquired some wealth and whatever they could lay hands upon [they spent] in eating and drinking with every one.³² Because of this they were liked by all and came to rule over many countries. Salaheddin became a very wealthy, arrogant, and belligerent man and began to threaten the Christians; his power increased from day to day, and, through his wisdom and shrewdness, he overthrew and utterly annihilated the authority of the Christians throughout his domains. In this same year Salaheddin marched against the King of Jerusalem; the King, the Franks of the coastland, the Count of Tripoli, and the Frères who wear garments marked with the cross joined forces against Salaheddin. The soldiers of the Franks were encamped on a hill, and the infidels suffered from lack of water. Then the apostate Count of Tripoli sent word to Salaheddin saying: 'What will you promise to give me if I should move the Christian armies and make them set camp in a place without water, so that you and your army may encamp by the water?'³³ And he [Saladin] promised him many treasures, confirming it in writing. Then the infidel Count set about advising the King and the chiefs and said: 'It is not good for us to remain here; come, let us leave this place and encamp on the hills where the wings of our army can be supported by our fortresses.' And he made everyone believe his wicked words, and when the Christians left that place, the Sultan encamped by the water, so the Christians could no longer reach the water, and were in great distress and uncertainty, and could find no solution to their predicament.³⁴ Then, in their despair they accepted death and rushed into battle. And when their front line was in battle

³² This account of Saladin's early life is purely imaginary. The continuator of Samuel of Ani also thought that Saladin's family had humble origins and that his father and uncle worked as wood carriers in Tekrit, (*RHC, Doc. arm.*, I, p. 453). For Saladin's origins see V. Minorsky, *Studies in Caucasian History*, (London, 1953), pp. 107-57.

³³ Smpad, like other Armenian and Syrian writers, echoes the accusations of treachery made against Raymond of Tripoli by several Western sources, but he alone mentions explicitly the message supposedly sent to Saladin. For a discussion of Raymond's so-called treachery see in particular Marshall W. Baldwin, *Raymond III of Tripolis and the Fall of Jerusalem*, (Princeton, 1936), pp. 156-60.

³⁴ For a discussion of the battle of Hattin see Baldwin, *ibid.*, pp. 151-5 and Runciman, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 486-91. Smpad seems to have known that the Franks did not camp at Hattin during the night, but moved up to the hill the following day, as has been shown by a recently discovered account: Jean Richard, "An Account of the Battle of Hattin referring to the Frankish Mercenaries in Oriental Moslem States," *Speculum*, 27 (1952) pp. 168-77.

formation, the infidel Count of Tripoli and his men deserted the Christians, which brought about the destruction of the Christians. The latter, being resigned to death, joined battle and, when the fighting had lasted a long time, they were defeated, for their men and beasts were disabled and weakened by thirst. There was great heat and a parching wind, and the hand of the Muslims was strengthened and they slew everyone. Then the King, who, together with a few soldiers was entrenched on the summit of a hill, begged to be taken to the Sultan, and the latter sent men and had him brought to him. When the King arrived, the Sultan went forth to meet him, bowed down, kissed, and embraced him; then, taking him by the hand, he made him enter his tent and sit on a cushion. And he sat humbly before him and said: 'Holy King, you are a thousand times welcome to the house of your brother. Be not saddened, for such is the fate of warfare, sometimes defeat and sometimes victory. You are a just and faithful King, true to your oath, and your righteousness pleases me. Because of this not one hair of your head shall fall; because of you I shall show mercy to many, and because of my love for you, I shall set many free.'³⁵ While he was saying this, they brought before him Raynald, Prince of Tripoli.³⁶ When the King saw him he arose; the Sultan also arose out of respect for the King, and he said to Raynald, Prince of Tripoli, who had betrayed the King, 'O infidel! I do not rise because of you, but because of your King.' And the Prince said: 'And I do not thank you, but my King.' And the King asked for some water, and the Sultan ordered it to be brought in a gold cup, mixed with rose-water and snow; and taking it, the Sultan, like a taster, sipped the water then presented it to the King; the King, taking it, drank half and gave it to the Prince of Tripoli, and he also drank of it.³⁷ And the Sultan said to the Prince: 'I am not giving this drink to you, but to your King.' And the Prince said to the Sultan: 'And I do not thank you, but my King.' And the Sultan said to the Prince: 'Unfaithful one, how many times have you sworn to me and pledged your faith, and have not kept your promise, but have enslaved and killed so many men; you seized my treasures on the route of Damascus and also, forgetting your oath, caused much blood to be shed at Sersim. What answer can you give now?''³⁸ And the Prince, answering, said to Sultan

³⁵ These words of welcome do not occur in any of the other sources, though there may be an indirect reference to them in one of the versions of the *Estoire d'Eracles* in which we read that Saladin felt greatly honored to have such rich prisoners in his power. (*RHC, Hist. occ.*, II, p. 67).

³⁶ There is a strange confusion here between Raymond and Reynald of Chatillon, for although the name is correct (Ernaghd = Reynald, not Eremund = Raymond), he is designated as Count of Tripoli. In Samuel of Ani's Chronography we find the same confusion (*RHC, Doc. arm.*, I p. 457).

³⁷ One of the versions of the *Estoire d'Eracles* also mentions the gold cup and the fact that the Sultan drank first before presenting the cup to the King (*RHC, Doc. occ.*, II, 67, third text). In all the other accounts the King drinks first and then passes the cup to Reynald.

³⁸ Saladin's reproaches are more specific than in the Western texts (*RHC, Doc. occ.*, II, pp. 67-9; *Chronique d'Ernoul*, ed. Mas Latrie [Paris, 1871], pp. 172-4), and are closer to the accounts of the Arab writers, for Smpad also refers to the treacherous capture of the caravan by Reynald on the way to Damascus (*RHC, Doc. or.*, I, pp. 55-6, 675-6, 687; IV, 258-9, 275-6; Beha ed-Din, *Life of Saladin*, *PPTS* [London, 1897], p. 115; Kemal ad-Din, in *Revue de l'Orient latin*, IV [1896], pp. 179-81). Bar Hebraeus says that the nobles urged Saladin to kill Reynald: *The Chronography of Gregory*

Salaheddin: 'Do not bark so. Do what you wish. I have already exacted the price of my blood from the Muslims for forty years, and henceforth I care nothing if I die.'³⁹ Then the Sultan signalled to the servants who seized him [the Prince] by the feet and hands and [threw him] before the Sultan; and he, drawing his steel sword, struck him on the loins and the servants killed him immediately. Seeing this, the King was greatly saddened, and the Sultan said: 'Do not grieve for the loss of one who was unfaithful to you.' Then they brought the Frères together with their Master and made them stand before him; and the Sultan said to the Master: 'O venerable head of your brethren, though you slew many of our soldiers, I love you because of your bravery. Now, abjure your faith and embrace our religion, and I shall give you presents and confer honors on you, and I shall set you all, and especially you, above my greatest men.' The Master answered and said: 'O great Sultan, willingly will I comply with your wish, but if you will so command, let me speak to my brethren and persuade them all to obey you.' And he granted him permission and said: 'Whoever does my will shall live, and whoever does not listen shall die by the sword.' Then the Master assembled everyone and said: 'O brethren, behold the days of the salvation of our souls have come, by which we shall inherit heaven. I beseech you, remain united and steadfast in the love of Christ; let us today mingle our blood with His redeeming blood; be not afraid of those who kill the body, but of those who subjugate the soul and the body, and let not passing greatness deceive us.' And he spoke many other words from the Holy Scriptures, enjoining them to die in their faith. And he returned to the Sultan and said: 'Some are obedient to your orders, but some are opposed; now, command that they be brought before you.' And when they came, he [the Sultan] began to question them, one by one, but they could not be swayed, and so he commanded that they all be killed. Then he said to the Master. 'And you, why do you consider accepting our faith?' And the Master, filling his mouth, spat in the Sultan's face so that being infuriated he [the Sultan] might kill him at once, and he should thus join his spiritual brothers. And he said to the Sultan: 'I exhorted them all to accept death, that they might earn the celestial life, so why should I do your will?' And the Sultan ordered that he also should be killed; and when they killed him, light descended on them from heaven [and shone] for three days, to the confusion and shame of the infidels and to the glory of the believers.⁴⁰

Abû'l Faraj ... Commonly known as *Bar Hebraeus* ... trans. from the Syriac by E. A. W. Budge, I (Oxford, 1932), p. 324. I have not been able to identify the locality called Sersim. Reynald intercepted the caravan as it was passing near Shobek, that is, near the Krak of Montreal (Beha ed-Din, *ibid.*, p. 114), but it is not absolutely clear in the Armenian text whether the bloodshed at Sersim refers to the capture of the caravan or to another event.

³⁹ In the same version of the *Estoire d'Eracles* mentioned above, Reynald also gives a truculent answer to Saladin, though the actual words are different: *RHC, Doc. occ.*, II, pp. 68-9.

⁴⁰ The Master of the Frères must be Gerard of Ridfort, the Grand Master of the Temple who, as we know from other sources, was one of the principal prisoners. Smpad's account, entirely favorable to Gerard of Ridfort, differs from that of the other sources. He is mistaken in thinking that Gerard was killed by Saladin, for we know that he was sent to Damascus with the other prisoners, was released

And when all this had happened in this manner, the Sultan freed the King, giving him many presents, and also those who were with him. And he commanded that each inhabitant of Jerusalem give one Egyptian *tahegan* per head, and that, taking from his house whatever he himself could carry he depart in peace, while those who wished to remain were to give yearly a red *tahegan* per head. Many remained, and many arose and departed. And Salaheddin took Jerusalem and its provinces, and gradually he seized all the coast land and the province of Antioch, and all the Christians trembled through fear of him. This same year, a certain Turcoman, called Resdom, gathered innumerable Turcomans and entered the land of the Cilicians, and he boasted of suppressing the very name of the Christians. He advanced as far as Sis and encamped before the city of Ravin, and the face of the earth was covered with this infinite multitude. Then Leon, strengthened by God, marched against them with thirty men and slew their leader Resdom, and they all turned and fled. Pursuing them as far as Sarvantik'ar Leon slaughtered them; and it is said that two warriors were seen to descend from the citadel of Sis and to slaughter them, and they were believed to be Saint George and Saint Theodore."⁴¹

Pp. 200–1 (pp. 629–30). After mentioning the death of the Constable Baldwin in 1188 and the subsequent capture of Bragana by Leon, the Venice manuscript adds that Leon killed the Master of the Citadel, the Emir Dip'li, who had murdered Baldwin. Mention of the fall of Jerusalem, erroneously dated in the year 1188 in the earlier publications, is omitted. The marriages of Leon's two nieces, Alice and Philippa, and his own marriage to a niece of Sibylla, the wife of Bohemond of Antioch, are dated 1188 instead of 1189. Events of later years, such as the death of the Catholicos and the election of his successor, are also placed under the year 1189 in the earlier publications, while in the Venice manuscript (pp. 204–5) they occur in their proper place, namely 1193. The account of the events of the intermediary years, 1189 to 1193, has been entirely omitted in the later redaction. It reads as follows:

shortly thereafter, and died in the battle before Acre, or, according to some sources, was captured and killed by Saladin. (*Ernoul*, p. 253; *RHC, Doc. occ.*, II, p. 130; *Doc. or.*, IV, p. 425; Ambroise, *The Crusade of Richard Lion Hearted*, trans. by Merton J. Hubert [New York, 1941], p. 143 and note 51). Only Kamal ad-Din reports that Saladin killed the Grand Master of the Templars after the battle of Hattin (*Revue de l'Orient latin*, 4 [1896], p. 180). According to Abu Shama, when Saladin sent word to Damascus to kill all the Templars and Hospitallers who had been taken as captives to that city, only those who refused to be converted to Islam were put to death, but they were the majority (*RHC, Hist. or.*, IV, p. 278). The account that comes closest to the Armenian text occurs in the *Itinerarium Peregrinorum et gesta regis Ricardi* (Rolls Series No. 38.1 [London, 1864], pp. 16–7), which mentions the miraculous light that shone on the Templars after their death; but in this text it is a certain Templar called Nicholas who encourages the others to die a martyr's death. *Templarios quoque, quotquot erant praeter Magistrum militiae decapetari praecipiens, ipsos penitus exterminare disposuit quos in bello caeteris noverat praevalere ... Inter hos Christi milites, Templarius quidam nomine Nicholaus, ita caeteris subeunde mortis persuasevat amorem, quod aliis praevenire certantibus, ipse martyrii gloriam vix primus poterat obtinere, quod tamen summopere affectabat. Nec defuit miraculosa divinae miserationis potentia; nam per tres noctes proximas eum sanctorum martyrum corpora adhuc insepulto jacerent, coelestis radius ignis desuper manifestus infulsit.*

⁴¹ The miraculous intervention of Saint George is also mentioned in the Rhymed Chronicle (*RHC, Doc. arm.*, I, p. 511). For the other sources on the Turcoman invasion see Cl. Cahen, *La Syrie du Nord*, pp. 425–6.

Pp. 201-4. "In the year 1189 the King of the Germans set forth with numerous soldiers and came to Constantinople; and he marched on Iconium, seized it, and slew the soldiers of Kilij Arslan. And Kilij Arslan gave him thirty great men as hostages and 100,000 *tahegans* and established friendship with him. And the Emperor came as far as Seleucia and, as it was summer and the heat was very great, the King went to swim in the river, but, overpowered by the onrush of the waters, for he was an old man, he was drowned. It is said that he had been foretold that he would die by water; that was why he had come by the long land route. As for his son, he went as far as Acre and died there after six months; then his soldiers scattered and departed.

"And in the year 1191 the King of the Franks came by ship to Acre with numerous soldiers and laid siege; Salaheddin also came, for the city belonged to him, and he encamped opposite them. The Frank soldiers dug three trenches round about themselves, they fortified their position, and scattered iron caltrops all around. The city was in great straits and the Sultan could not come to the help of the citizens. At that time the King of the English came to Cyprus and took it from the Greeks; he captured the Duke Coman  [Isaac Ducas Comnenus] and brought him to Acre. The two Kings, joining forces, fought bravely against the Sultan and the citizens. Then the Sultan sent word to the Kings and said: 'Take back your city and sell the men for their weight in silver and gold.' They answered and said: 'Out of respect for you, it would be right for us to do so, but because we have sworn before the Holy Sepulchre of Christ to kill everyone by the sword, we cannot perjure ourselves.' And so they took the city and killed 36,000 men there; and Salaheddin fled.⁴²

"In the year 1192 there was a severe famine, and it is impossible to describe in writing the greatness of the suffering; so many men died that the dead could not be buried, and the living envied those who had already died. When springtime came, they ate the grass like sheep, and because of this unwonted food they fell and died. This same year Kilij Arslan, the Sultan of Iconium died, and Salaheddin began to harass great Antioch with a view to capturing it. But the astrologers told him, 'You cannot conquer it,' and the Sultan desisted from his plan. Antioch suffered from famine, for no food could be brought into the city for fear of the Sultan. And the citizens said to the Prince: 'Behold, we die of hunger, what should we do?' And the Prince said: 'Wait for me for fifteen days and then I shall give you an answer.' Then the Prince arose and took with him five horsemen and went to Salaheddin while he was still encamped opposite Acre. He arrived at the door of the pavilion and said to the doorkeepers: 'Tell the Sultan the Prince of Antioch is here and wishes to see him.' When the Sultan heard this he immediately came out to him, and taking him by the hand, made him enter the pavilion and bade him sit down. And he [the Prince] said: 'I have a request; if you should grant it

⁴² On the siege and capitulation of Acre see Runciman, *Hist. of Crusades*, III (1954), pp. 47-51.

I shall sit down.' And he said: 'What you request is granted. Speak.' And the Prince said: 'I beg you to grant me Antioch.' And the Sultan said: 'It is granted, and moreover I shall give to you and your city sufficient food for three years.' And they became friends and he returned to Antioch, and the city was filled with abundant food.⁴³

"In the year 1193 when the Prince returned from [his visit to] Salaheddin he spoke to his wife of his intention of seizing Leon, and she said: 'Do not do such a disloyal deed for he is my son-in-law, and he always comes willingly to your service and helps you in your wars.' But he did not desist from his evil plans and sent an invitation to him. And Leon went forth to Baghras. And the wife of the Prince sent word in secret to Leon. And Leon invited the Prince to come to him at Baghras so that he might entertain them there and then they would proceed together to Antioch. And they came willingly; Leon went out to meet them, escorted them to Baghras, and there seized the Prince and, taking him, imprisoned him in the citadel of Sis, and kept a careful watch over him.⁴⁴

"This same year the Sultan Salaheddin sent word to Leon bidding him to cede the land of Cilicia after which he would be allowed to depart safely. Leon was in doubt as to what he should do, but putting his trust in God he said to the messengers: 'Tell the Sultan I have no land to give you, but should you come to my land I shall let you taste of the double-edged sword, as I did to your coreligionary Resdom.' Upon hearing this the Sultan growled like a lion, and made ready his army and set out towards Cilicia to annihilate the believers in Christ; he had come as far as the Black River when he fell ill and died there. And his son called Melek' Dahr succeeded him."⁴⁵

There are no significant differences between the two redactions for the events which took place in Cilicia during the years 1193 (after the death of Saladin)

⁴³ I have found no other reference to the famine in Antioch. According to the Arab sources and to Bar Hebraeus (*op. cit.*, pp. 340-1) Bohemond of Antioch visited Saladin on October 30th at Beirut, not at Acre. Saladin "entertained him hospitably, granting him the territory of el-'Amk—corn lands, the crop bringing in an annual return of fifteen thousand gold pieces (dinârs) annually" (Beha ed-Din *The Life of Saladin*, p. 395. See also Abu Shama, *RHC. Doc. or.* V, pp. 89, 91). Bohemond's request, as reported by Smpad ("I beg you to grant me Antioch") should be interpreted as referring to the plain of el-'Amk, known in ancient times as the Plain of Antioch. Saladin had acquired this territory "in the year 584 (A.D. 1188-1189) at the time of the conquest of the coast land," Beha ed-Din, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

⁴⁴ The new edition gives the correct date, 1193, for the *guet-apens* of Baghras while in the later redaction this is related under the year 1195, along with the arrival of Henry of Champagne (*RHC, Doc. arm.*, I, p. 631). In the Venice manuscript the arrival of Henry of Champagne and the negotiations for Bohemond's release are told separately, in their proper places (*op. cit.*, pp. 206-7). The *guet-apens* is mentioned before the death of Saladin, but Saladin died on March 4, 1193 (Beha ed-Din, *op. cit.*, p. 406) and Bohemond was still in Antioch in September of that year (Cahen, *op. cit.*, p. 583 and note 4).

⁴⁵ We have no other information about Saladin's intention to invade Cilicia. After his meeting with Bohemond at Beirut, he went to Damascus on November 4, 1192 (Beha ed-Din, *op. cit.*, p. 396; Bar Hebraeus, *op. cit.*, p. 341), and spent the winter months there, being too ill to undertake any campaign. The Black River is probably the Kara Su which joins the Orontes in its lower course; a Muslim expeditionary force may have approached that region, but it could not have been directed by Saladin, who died in Damascus. Melek' Dahr is Melik az-Zahir, Lord of Aleppo.

to 1200.⁴⁶ For the year 1201 there is no entry in the later copies, while in the Venice manuscript we find the following passage:

P. 212. "In the year 1201 the Sultan Rukn ad-Din went East with many soldiers and, not by warfare but by peaceful means, captured the city of Theodosiopolis, which is the city of Garin.⁴⁷ Then, arrogantly, he proceeded to Mjngerd, and while he was attacking that fortress the Georgian soldiers arrived and routed him.⁴⁸ They seized the Lord of Erzinjan, Shah Vahram, and returned to their country with rich booty.⁴⁹ The Sultan appointed his brother, Tughril Shah, Lord of the city of Garin.⁵⁰ He was a kind man and throughout the days of his life he remained on friendly terms with King Leon, and he greatly loved the Christians. His brother, the Sultan, returned to his country."

There are some differences between the two redactions in the account of the events of the year 1203. The Venice manuscript mentions the intervention of the catholicos Grigoris on behalf of his nephew Het'um, which is omitted in the later copies, but does not give as many details about the destruction of the church vessels carried out by order of the catholicos Hohannes.⁵¹ Under the year 1204 it records the death of Rukn ad-Din and the accession of his son Soliman Shah (p. 213). The entries for the year 1205 are the same in both redactions, but the events of the years 1206 to 1216 are either omitted or very briefly mentioned in the later redaction.

Pp. 214-5 (pp. 642-3). "In the year 1206 Bohemond, Prince of Antioch, died, and his son, the one-eyed Count of Tripoli succeeded him.⁵² Leon

⁴⁶ See Alishan, *Léon le Magnifique*, pp. 173-7, who, in his account of the coronation of Leon I, reproduces the passage in which the bishop and barons of Armenia are listed (In Akelian, *op. cit.*, pp. 208-10).

⁴⁷ Smpad does not speak of the raid into Cilicia by Rukn ad-Din which is known through other sources (Cahen, *op. cit.* p. 601). According to Abu'l Feda, Rukn ad-Din took Theodosiopolis (= Erzerum) from Mohammad ibn Saltak (*RHC, Hist. or.*, I, p. 79).

⁴⁸ This victory is told in great detail in the Georgian Annals. *Histoire de la Géorgie depuis l'antiquité jusqu'au XIX^e siècle*, traduite du Géorgien par M. Brosset, I (St. Petersburg, 1849), pp. 456-63.

⁴⁹ The Georgian Annals do not give the name of the Lord of Erzinjan, but we find his full name, Melik Fakhr Eddin Bahram Shah, in the Seljuk Nameh (Ch. Schefer, *Quelques chapitres de l'abregé du Seldjouq Nameh* [Paris, 1889], pp. 39-40).

⁵⁰ Rukn ad-Din appears to have first named Aha Eddin Saliqy as governor and later deposed him in favor of his brother, Tughril Shah (Schefer, *ibid.*, p. 40).

⁵¹ In the Etchmiadzin manuscripts, after the enumeration of the precious vessels and other treasures destroyed by the Catholicos, we read: "And do not blame us for writing this, for we know it not by hearsay, but we saw and touched with our hands these objects while they were being destroyed" (*Doc. arm.*, I, p. 641). Alishan had already remarked that this sentence could not have been written by Smpad, since he was only a few years old when the destruction took place and he was not at Hromgla. It should, therefore, be considered as a later addition, like those mentioned above (p. 146). There are other signs that this passage has been altered by the addition of information derived from a source hostile to the Catholicos, for the introduction of several words into the preceding paragraph, relating to the person of the Catholicos, results in obvious contradictions. Hohannes is said to be "humble in heart and perfidious, simple in his appearance, but indifferent to spiritual matters. He greatly loved virtuous people." The corresponding passage in the Venice manuscript reads: "he was humble in heart, simple in his person and zealous in spiritual matters. He greatly loved virtuous people ..." (p. 213).

⁵² The correct date of Bohemond III's death is 1201 (Cahen, *La Syrie du Nord* p. 594). Het'um (Hayton) of Gorigos has the correct date (Akopian, *op. cit.*, II, p. 61).

sent a messenger to him and showed him the treaty which the Count's father had made with the King whereby the son of Bohemond's eldest son was to succeed him, of which we spoke previously, but he [the Count of Tripoli] rejected the treaty and did not recognize [his nephew's] rights. Then the King sent to the Patriarch of Antioch and showed him the same document, and the Patriarch testified to the King's rightful claim, but the Count would not agree. Then the Patriarch excommunicated him and ordered that no bells should be rung in Antioch, no Mass be celebrated, no dead be buried, but he [the Count] refused to obey. He even dared to lay hands on the Patriarch and to put him in prison, where he was tormented by hunger and thirst. He sent [men] to him saying, 'Testify on my behalf, that I am the rightful master of Antioch, and you will be set free and live.' The Patriarch never agreed to do this, and he died in prison of hunger and thirst without uttering a lie. From this time on there was bitter enmity between the King and the Prince.

"In the year 1207 the Counts of Venice and of Flanders came to Constantinople and took the city from the Greeks; they massacred and put to flight everyone, and from then on the Greeks ceased to rule in Constantinople.⁵³

"This same year, under some pretext, Leon seized the Sebastos Heri and his sons Constance Camardias and Joscelin and Baldwin; he chained and imprisoned them. Heri was the son-in-law of Hohannes, the Catholicos of the Armenians, and this caused serious dissension between King Leon and the Catholicos Hohannes. Their hatred for one another grew to such an extent that the King, the prelates, and the barons of Cilicia deposed the Catholicos and in his place appointed David, Archbishop of Msis and Abbot of Ark'agaghin as Catholicos of the Armenians. And Hohannes remained at Hromgla in retirement, and through his courage and wisdom he was able to circumvent the King's numerous secret or overt intrigues. Meanwhile, the Sultan Khosrov shah [Kaikhaus I], son of Kilij Arslan, reigned over the land of Rum, and began to threaten King Leon; induced and encouraged by Der Hohannes, he marched with many soldiers on Pertous, captured it, and seized its master Krikor, son of Leon; and from then on Pertous ceased to belong to the Armenians. And this happened in the year 1208."

In referring to the establishment of the Empire of Nicaea, Smpad mentions how the Seljuk Sultan was killed by the soldiers of Lascaris in 1209 (p. 216). He then relates that Leon appointed Raymond-Rupen heir to the throne, and how he blinded and imprisoned Kork, the illegitimate son of Mleh.⁵⁴ He also speaks of the invasions into the territory of Antioch, where Leon destroyed villages and cut down trees and vineyards (p. 217). In 1210 Leon sent Het'um of Lampron to the Pope and to the German Emperor and obtained a crown for

⁵³ This incorrect date is repeated in the later redaction. *RHC, Doc. arm.*, I, p. 642.

⁵⁴ Parts of this section are quoted by Alishan, *Léon le Magnifique*, pp. 278-9.

Raymond-Rupen; he married Sybil, the sister of the King of Cyprus while another sister was married to the young Rupen (p. 217). In 1211 after the death of the Catholicos David, there was a reconciliation between the King and the former Catholicos Hohannes, and the sons of Heri, Joscelin and Baldwin, were released.

P. 217. "This same year [1211] the Lord of Garin, Tughril shah, prompted by Leon, marched with a large army on the city of Cesarea; Leon also came with a large force and the two together made war against Kaikhaus, Tughril's nephew, but after tarrying several days without being able to accomplish anything, they returned each one to his country."

For the years 1211-1213 Smpad mentions briefly the death of Zak'aré, Lord of Ani, the complete reconciliation between the Catholicos and the King, and the marriage of Leon's daughter Rita to John of Brienne at Acre (pp. 218-9). The description of Leon's entry into Antioch in 1216, which is recounted in some detail, the passage relating to the selection of Leon's daughter as heiress to the throne in lieu of Raymond-Rupen, and the account of the siege of Damietta have been quoted by Alishan and need not be repeated here.⁵⁵

The Seljuk wars are related more fully in the later redaction,⁵⁶ but in almost every other instance the Venice manuscript records events which are either omitted or greatly abridged.

Pp. 222-3, A.D. 1219. Account of King Leon's death and burial.

Pp. 223-5, A.D. 1220. Revolt of some Armenian and Greek barons against the bailiff Constantine.⁵⁷ Death of the Catholicos Hohannes and election of Gostandin (Constantine) of Partzrpert.

P. 225 (pp. 647-8), A.D. 1222. Marriage of Zabel, daughter of King Leon, to Philip of Antioch.⁵⁸ Imprisonment and death of Philip.

P. 225 (p. 648), A.D. 1226. Marriage of Zabel to Het'um, son of the bailiff Constantine.⁵⁹

P. 225, A.D. 1229. The German Emperor seizes Jerusalem.⁶⁰

P. 229, A.D. 1252. Death of Queen Zabel.

Pp. 229-30, A.D. 1253. King Het'um goes to the court of Mangu Khan.⁶¹ Het'um's daughter, Sibyl, marries Bohemond of Antioch.

⁵⁵ Alishan, *op. cit.*, pp. 257-8, 286-9; Akelian, *op. cit.*, pp. 219-20.

⁵⁶ Akelian, p. 221-2; *RHC, Doc. arm.*, I, p. 644-5.

⁵⁷ See the translation of excerpts from this passage in Alishan, *Sissouan*, p. 314.

⁵⁸ The stipulations set by the Armenians before the marriage are mentioned in the later redaction and not in the Venice manuscript, but in the latter we read that Philip "began to send to Antioch, little by little, the riches collected by King Leon and his predecessors." This statement agrees with the remarks of the historians Kirakos and Vardan (*RHC, Doc. arm.*, I, pp. 428, 442-3).

⁵⁹ The account in the later redaction is again more detailed. In the Venice manuscript the story of Zabel's flight to Seleucia is omitted and one can understand that Smpad preferred not to dwell on Zabel's reluctance to marry his brother. This section in the Etchmiadzin manuscripts shows obvious signs of modifications and, to some extent, of confusions. The birth of Het'um's and Zabel's eldest son is recorded under the same year 1226, instead of 1236, and likewise under the same year we find the account of the Seljuk invasion of Cilicia of 1245. (*Doc. arm.*, I, p. 649).

⁶⁰ Ten folios are missing from this point down to the year 1252. See above p. 143.

⁶¹ Smpad's account, though shorter, is in substantial agreement with that of Kirakos (ed. Tiflis [1909], pp. 350-7). The only addition contained in Smpad is the statement that Mangu Khan appointed two of his servants to accompany Het'um: "Margadea, who was one-eyed, and Batcho."

P. 230, A.D. 1254, Raids by a certain Turcoman named Islam-Beg.⁶²

P. 230, A.D. 1255. Death of Prince Geoffrey of Cilicia, who had been made a eunuch.

Pp. 231-2, A.D. 1256. Het'um returns from the Mongol court in the month of September, and makes successful raids into the sultanate of Rûm.⁶³ On November 15 Het'um's son Leon is knighted in the presence of a large assembly of Armenian and Latin princes and barons.

Pp. 232-3. "In the year 1258, the Nation of the Archers set out and marched on the city of Babylon [Bagdad] with their generals and captains, having as their supreme commander the Khan Hulagu, and they surrounded and harassed the city. The inhabitants of the city were very numerous, all the Muslim nations being assembled there for two reasons: first, because the year before they had heard that the Khan would march against them and had made all the preparations for war; second, because the Caliph who resided in Cairo was no longer there. At the time of King Baldwin who resided in Jerusalem and molested Egypt, the Sultan of Aleppo came and killed the Caliph, and from then on the impure see of their pontiff was transferred to Bagdad. That is why they were assembled there by order of their leader. Then the inhabitants of the city marched against the Nation of the Archers, and they killed many of their soldiers and routed them, and after pursuing them for a while they returned to their city. But they [the Mongols] again marched against the city, and the Caliph sent to Khan Hulagu, saying: 'Take your soldiers and depart from us, lest when I display the mantle of the prophet, you be utterly lost.'⁶⁴ But if there be among you men who follow our religion, I shall spare them.' When the Khan heard these words he [and his companions] mocked the Caliph; they spat as if they were spitting in the Caliph's face, and Hulagu, raising his voice, said: 'With the help of God and the counsel of Jenghiz Khan we shall destroy by the edge of the sword all of you who boast in the prophet.' After these words, the two armies marched against one another; the Nation of the Archers attacked and raising a loud cry they struck at the enemy with great force, routed them completely, and, entering the city after them, massacred so many men and women that for many days the wide Euphrates river which ran through the city was tainted with blood. They continued to slaughter until they were exhausted; then they appointed chiefs and tax collectors and returned to their country with rich booty."

P. 233, A.D. 1258. Het'um's younger brother, Leon, dies on May 30 in the city of Adana, just before setting out for Cyprus. Raid of the Turcoman Sarum.⁶⁵

⁶² Alishan, *Sissouan*, p. 377. Cl. Cahen, "Les Turcomans de Rûm," *Byzantion*, 14 (1939), p. 133.

⁶³ Quoted in part by Alishan, *ibid.*, p. 187.

⁶⁴ The reference to the prophet's mantle or standard also occurs in Kirakos, *op. cit.*, p. 365, but Hulagu is said merely to have answered, "God knows what He will do."

⁶⁵ Alishan, *Sissouan*, p. 377; Cahen, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

P. 234, A.D. 1259. Het'um goes to Tripoli to make peace between the Prince of Antioch and the Count of Tripoli. On the day of the feast of Pentecost, Het'um's brother Baldwin is consecrated bishop at Tarsus, and called John (Hohannes); on the same day Het'um's son, T'oros, is knighted.

Pp. 234, A.D. 1259. "But before this a baron by the name of Oshin, of Greek nationality, captured the fort of Muntas. Hearing this, the Sultan of Rûm, Rukneddin, assembled a large army, appointed a chief, and sent it to besiege the aforementioned fort of Muntas. Then a man was sent forth from the fort, and coming to King Het'um, told him that numerous Christians were gathered there and that the Sultan had marched against them."⁶⁶

Pp. 235-7. "In the year 1260 Khan Hulagu and his mighty host advanced like a spring torrent, seizing the forts of the infidels wherever they passed, some peacefully, some by fighting. Thus he advanced as far as Aleppo, surrounded the city, and sent word to King Het'um to join him; and the latter immediately came to the Khan with his army, and the Khan received him joyfully. And the victorious Khan harassed Aleppo with numerous engines, and in seven days he opened a way for the invaders in spite of the great width of the ramparts and the depth of the ditch.⁶⁷ Then they all raised such a loud cry that the earth shook and trembled at the sound; entering the city they marched on the citadel and, drawing their swords, mercilessly slaughtered the nation of the Ismaelites. However, they did not sin against the faithful by killing them, but only plundered their belongings. No one can tell how many were killed. Taking their booty and captives they proceeded to Damascus, and subjugated the towns, villages, and fortresses, all the way to Jerusalem. Over that region the Khan appointed as governor and commander a man called Kitbuqa, and the brave and powerful Khan, taking his soldiers and his son, Abaga, went East to his own country. However, the commander Kitbuqa did not follow the instructions of the Khan who had appointed him to remain at that place, but collecting his soldiers and 500 men from Cilicia whom he had asked the King to send him, set out with the intention of entering Egypt.⁶⁸ When the Egyptian spies saw this and immediately notified their people, an army was called up and went forth to meet the enemy some four days' journey from their place, at a locality called Brr.⁶⁹ The two

⁶⁶ The remainder of this account, and the successes of the Armenians under the leadership of Constable Smpad himself, are quoted by Alishan, *ibid.*, p. 191. In the later redaction this long story is reduced to the statement that Het'um took the fort of Muntas (*RHC, Doc. arm.*, I, p. 651).

⁶⁷ The seven days' siege agrees with the account of Rashid ad-Din (*Histoire des Mongols de la Perse*, ed. Quatremère [Paris, 1836], p. 335) and of Abu'l Feda (*RHC, Doc. or.*, I, p. 140). Hayton in *La Flor des estoires de la terre d'Orient*, says that the siege lasted for nine days and that the citadel resisted for eleven more days (*RHC, Doc. arm.*, II, pp. 171 and 302).

⁶⁸ Smpad and the author of the *History of the Nation of the Archers* are the only ones who state that Kitbuqa initiated the Mongol-Egyptian war. *History of the Nation of the Archers (the Mongols) by Grigor of Akanc'*. Edited with an English Translation and Notes by Robert P. Blake and Richard N. Frye (Cambridge, Mass., 1954), p. 349 (81).

⁶⁹ All the Muslim sources say that the battle took place at Ain Jalud, that is, the Springs of Goliath, between Nablus and Beisan, and the same locality is designated by Hayton under the varying forms

armies encamped half a day's distance from one another. When the sun arose, they clashed and fought violently, but because of the great heat and the sickness among their horses the Nation of the Archers was defeated and fled. The Egyptians pursued them and few of them escaped; Kitbuqa was killed on the battlefield, while his wife and sons were taken captive to Egypt. The remnants of the army went to Hulagu Khan and related what had happened, and he, growling like a lion, promised to go and seek revenge for the blood of his soldiers.

"This same year Het'um, King of the Armenians, assembled his soldiers and, having set forth as for an excursion, he passed between Cappadocia and Iconium, going out to meet the Nation of the Archers at Gangra, in Galatia, which was on the borders of Smyrna and [the land] of Lascaris, for [the Mongols] had previously asked him to join them. However, when the King made preparation for his departure, [the Mongols] had already gone beyond that place, but because of his fear of them, he did not interrupt his journey, and, though facing death, he proceeded with a few men, as we have said. But nothing was achieved, for the men against whom they went had heard that they were coming and had fortified themselves in the caverns and grottoes of the rocks; and they [the Armenians] all returned empty-handed to their homes. And one of the barons of King Het'um, of Greek nationality, called Vasil Geronents, died on the way, and they brought his body to Cilicia, and buried him there, in the sepulchre of his ancestors."

P. 237, A.D. 1261. Het'ums daughter Rita, marries Constantine, the son of the Lord of Sarvantik'ar. Geoffrey of Sarvantik'ar dies, leaving three sons, Constantine, Smpad, and Oshin. There is no entry for the year 1262.

Pp. 237-8, A.D. 1263. Constantine, father of King Het'um, dies on Sunday, February 24.

Pp. 238-40. Long account of the struggle with the Karamanides which took place before the death of Constantine. This entire passage, except for the words of advice addressed by Constantine to his son, King Het'um, has been quoted by Alishan and commented on by Cl. Cahen.⁷⁰

Pp. 241-2. "In the year 1263, Het'um, King of the Armenians, went on a friendly visit to Antioch to see the city, and he took with him the venerable doctor and Archbishop of Anazarba, Der Hagop, also some priests and deacons, and many golden and silver treasures from the treasury of his father Constantine, in order to distribute them among the poor and to offer them to the sanctuaries as a memorial to his soul. When the King entered the city, he was joyfully greeted; walking through the

of Aïmeloc or Haymaloth (*RHC, Doc. arm.*, III, pp. 175 and 305). Kirakos and Vardan say that the battle took place at the foot of Mount Thabor (Kirakos, [Tiflis, 1909], p. 373; Vardan [Venice, 1862], p. 152). The place called Brr by Smpad is probably Zer'in which is only a short distance west of Ain Jalud (*Encyclopedia of Islam*, s.v. Ain Djalut).

⁷⁰ Alishan, *Sissouan*, pp. 344-6; Cahen, in *Byzantion*, 14 (1939), pp. 133-5.

city, he visited Saint Paul and Peter and other churches, and offered them presents; he also went to the monastery called Djebik' [?] and made his father Constantine a fellow-member of their brotherhood; he, the King himself, became their brother and he gave them many gifts, by testament, so that they should come to his country each year to collect them. He remained in Antioch for some time and then returned to his country, Cilicia.

"This same year, in the month of June, King Het'um went east to Hulagu Khan, because every year the people of Cappadocia molested the Cilicians who lived at the foot of the mountains. And because he was very fond of the King, Khan Hulagu sent equitable Mongol judges after him,⁷¹ who journeyed with the King as far as Heraclea; the Sultan of Rûm Rukneddin also arrived and they remained there for a few days, swore a pact of friendship, and made peace. And the King and the Sultan became as father and son, and each one returned to his country. This same year Kyra Mary, Countess of Jaffa and sister of King Het'um, who had come to see her father, Constantine, because of her sorrow, reached the end of her lifetime and died at the fort of Lampron; she was buried in the holy monastery of Sgevra. She left two sons and three daughters."

Pp. 242-4. "In the year 1264 King Het'um gathered together an army, and with many foot soldiers from among the common people, he invaded the province of Aleppo and the small towns of Martmsrin, Srmin and also Fugha.⁷² There they won some booty and a few servants; it was there also that King Het'um had a narrow escape. Taking with him two eunuchs from among his servants and one of his barons, Constantine Ablhasnants, he left his soldiers and entered that town, walking carelessly without cuirass or helmet. Suddenly they met twenty infidels, dressed in armor, who were on their way to the citadel, which was in the middle of the town, in order to protect those who had fled and gathered there. When they came face to face, the King did not know what to do; the infidels did not know who he was, and one of them pounced to strike the King with his sword, but the eunuch Joscelyn intercepted the stroke. Once more the man raised his sword to strike the King and the Baron Constantine diverted the stroke, and, drawing the King to one side, he faced the man. The infidels went on and entered the citadel, and thus the King escaped alive; he

⁷¹ The word used in the text is *arghoutchik*'. According to the Malkhasiants Dictionary (Erevan, 1944) this word is derived from the Tatar *yarguçi* which means "judge" and serves to designate the Mongol judges. In the Chronicle ascribed to King Het'um II, under the year 1263 we read: "King Het'um and Sultan Rukneddin and the *arghoutchik*' assembled at Heraclea for the purpose of dividing the forts between them." (Akopian, *Manr jamanakagrout'younner, XVII-XVIIIc*, I [1951], p. 82. Akopian gives good reasons for ascribing this Chronicle to Het'um II rather than to Het'um [Hayton] of Gorigos, pp. 65-73.) See Pelliot's comments on the tribal name Argun and his suggestion that this name may be the Argons mentioned by Marco Polo (P. Pelliot, "Une ville musulmane dans la Chine de Nord sous les Mongols," *Journal asiatique*, CCXI [1927], p. 265, note 3). Marco Polo says that these "Argons," who sprang from two different races, were handsomer and more capable than the other natives and consequently acquired considerable authority among the Mongols (ed. Yule-Cordier, I [New York, 1903], p. 284).

⁷² These are the towns of Ma'arra Miçrîn (in Latin: Megaret Basrîn), Sermin and Fou'a, southwest of Aleppo: Cahen, *La Syrie du Nord*, p. 156.

returned to his land with rich booty and there was great rejoicing. This same year Het'um again assembled his soldiers and marched on the fort of Aıntab, but returned to his land without having been able to make any headway against the fort. After a short time, during the winter, King Het'um thought of returning against the same fort of Aıntab, but when he reached Bourdj ar-Rasas he had to stop, for the sun was darkened by a cloud and did not appear for five days. Because of the violence of the wind and the rain, they could not leave their tents, and the servants and common footsoldiers suffered greatly. They, therefore, thought of returning, saying, 'God does not want us to go farther.' There was among them a Frank named Martin, a surgeon honored by the King, and he spoke to the King and nobles who were gathered at their deliberations, some saying, 'Let us turn back,' and others saying, 'Let us not turn back.' [Martin said] 'O King and princes, spend this night outside your tents, and then discuss whether to turn back or to stay.' And the words he spoke convinced them; many of them praised him and they returned peacefully. This same year Het'um again called an assembly for he wanted to plunder the district of Aleppo, but it being winter he could not put his plan into effect.

In the year 1264-1265, Khan Hulagu sent one of his generals, together with a large army, to the impregnable fort of Bir which was in the hands of the infidels.⁷³ The general, whose name was Durba, raising bastions, sorely harassed the fort and demolished the walls of the ramparts and the tower. Durba then sent to ask King Het'um to join him, and the King, having mustered his soldiers and his relatives at the fortress called T'il Hamdun, celebrated there the feast of Epiphany. Then, after a few days' Het'um assembled his soldiers and went out to meet Durba, and proceeded as far as a place called Pampgtzor; he sent 200 cavalry men ahead to Durba and was himself to follow them. At that time came the welcome news that a son was born to Leon, baron of the Armenians, at Msis, and this was in January.... And who can describe the joy of the King, of the nobles, and of the people at this news? And many, even of those who were least worthy as well as some of the eunuchs, were honored by being knighted. Then news came that Durba had left Bir because the Sultan of Egypt had arrived against him; hearing this, the King returned to his home."

Pp. 244-5. This same year, at Easter, Prince Leon's son is baptized and Smpad's two sons, Het'um and Vasil the Tatar, are knighted. The Sultan of Egypt, Baibars, comes as far as the outskirts of Antioch, at the Black River, but hearing that the Armenians had assembled a large army, he withdraws without entering Cilicia.

P. 245 (p. 651). Oshin, Lord of Gorigos, brother of the King, dies on December 26 at Tarsus and is buried at Sis.

⁷³ Baron C. d'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, III (The Hague and Amsterdam, 1834), pp. 404-6.

Pp. 245-7. "In the year 1266, the Sultan of Egypt once more assembled an army and, advancing as far as the fortresses of the Frères who wear the garments marked with the cross, he captured Arsuf, Safeth, and other forts.⁷⁴ Then turning away from Cilicia, he came to Damascus and remained there for some days. And after receiving the ambassadors of King Het'um, who had come to persuade him to make peace, he sent his own ambassadors; for the Sultan wanted to make peace, but demanded from the King fortresses and other localities which bordered his own lands. The King did not comply with these demands for two reasons; first, because of his fear of the Archers [Mongols], lest they should say that King Het'um was an ally of the Sultan of Egypt, and had given him the places and fortresses freed by them; and second, although the Sultan's demand was not great—being but a ruined place called Sheh⁷⁵—and he said of it, 'Give me that locality so that I might make a market-place for us and for you,' the King would not cede it so as not to come under the authority of the Sultan. For he had been a victorious and famous King for many years, while the Sultan had been the servant of a vile servant and had of late become so powerful that everyone feared him. The King several times sent his noblemen to the Sultan with most handsome presents, so as to win his friendship, but the Sultan persisted in his demand for the above-mentioned place. Assembling his army, the Sultan came as far as Aleppo, appointed as supreme commander of his army one of his noblemen called Smlmot', and as his seconds, Alfi and the Sultan of Aleppo, and he sent them to Cilicia against the army of King Het'um, and he himself remained where he was.⁷⁶ They arrived at the place called Nicopolis, at the foot of the Black Mountain, and encamped there. The soldiers of King Het'um were divided into three groups; one was with the King who had gone to ask the Nation of the Archers to help his army; the second was at the place called the Gate [Portella], and the third had been sent against the infidels at the place called Mari, on Monday, October 23, and had encamped there.⁷⁷

⁷⁴ Other sources date the capture of Arsuf in February-April 1265: Cahen, *op. cit.*, p. 714. The Chronicle ascribed to Het'um II (Akopian, *op. cit.*, I, p. 83) mentions the capture of Arsuf from the Hospitallers in 1264, and the loss of the forts of Safed and Arassous by the Templars in 1266. Het'um (Hayton) of Gorigos gives the correct dates: Arsuf was captured in 1265 and Safed on July 22, 1266 (*ibid.*, II, pp. 72-3).

⁷⁵ Sheh is the locality known as Chih al-Hadid or Shih al-Hadid (Alishan, *op. cit.*, p. 512; Cahen, *op. cit.*, p. 137). Grigor of Agner reports that after the disaster suffered by the Cilician army, the nobles reproached the King for not ceding this locality. They said, "What use is Sheh to us, that for the sake of Sheh you lost your sons?" (*History of the Nation of Archers*, p. 364 [96]). The geographic name has been misunderstood in the English translation and interpreted as "inhabited locality," as if it were derived from the word "shen" (*ibid.*, p. 391, note 65). Smpad's text, already quoted by Alishan, leaves no doubt that Sheh designates the border town of Shih al-Hadid.

⁷⁶ Smlmot' = Izz eddin Igan surnamed Semm el-maut (the deadly poison), who died in 1276-1277 (cf. Makrizi, *op. cit.*, I, 2, p. 146). He is also mentioned by Vardan (Venice, 1862, pp. 163-4) and in the Chronicle of Het'um II (*op. cit.*, p. 83; see, also *RHC, Doc. arm.*, I, p. 487). Abu'l Feda says that Baibars placed his army under the command of El-Malek el-Mansur, Prince of Hamah (*RHC, Doc. or.*, I, p. 157). d'Ohsson (*op. cit.*, III, p. 421) referring to Nuwa'ri, mentions both Semm el-maut (Yzz-ad-din Aigan) and the Prince of Hamah, and adds the name of the Mameluk emir Qalawun (Seif ud-din-Calavoun).

⁷⁷ Mari = Phylae Amanides, the passage from Syria to Cilicia (*RHC, Doc. arm.*, I, pp. XXVI-XXVIII and 827), is also mentioned in the *History of the Nation of the Archers*, p. 357 (89).

Early on Tuesday morning the infidels arrived at the place where the Christian army stood, and for a short while they remained facing one another; then, through the wiles of Satan, the Christian soldiers turned to flight without fighting, but the sons of the King, Leon, Baron of the Armenians, and his brother T'oros, left the soldiers, turned back, and advanced to fight against the infidels. T'oros was killed during this battle, while the Baron Leon was taken prisoner together with Vasil the Tatar, the son of Smpad, general-in-chief of the Armenians, as well as other men among whom were a certain Djilard [Gerard?] and Adom."

Pp. 247-50, A.D. 1266-1268. The author gives a fairly detailed description of the destruction of Sis and of the terrible slaughter of the population; he then relates the protracted transactions between the King and the Sultan for the release of the Baron Leon and the other prisoners. In return the Sultan asks the Armenians to obtain the release of his favorite, Sonqor al-Ashkar, whom the Mongols held captive.⁷⁸ Het'um himself goes to the court of Abaga in 1267, but is told that the prisoner cannot be found. The following year Leon, the son of the Constable Smpad, is sent to the Mongols, succeeds in finding Sonqor al-Ashkar, and returns with him to Sis. Messengers bring the news to the Sultan.

P. 250, A.D. 1268. "Then the Sultan set forth with all his soldiers and marched on Tripoli, and caused great damage to the city. From there he marched for five days without stopping day or night, and suddenly descended on the famous city of Antioch; he took it after four days, on Saturday, May 6.⁷⁹ No one can describe the carnage that took place, or the number of those who were taken captive, or the amount of treasure carried away to Egypt. But few Armenians were killed, for those who were from Cilicia were allowed by the Sultan to return thither. The commander of Antioch also saved himself with his family, and came to Cilicia; it was said that it was through his advice that the city had been betrayed into the hands of the Sultan, but only the Lord knows the truth."⁸⁰

⁷⁸ The imprisonment and release of Leon are related in great detail in the *History of the Nation of the Archers*, pp. 356-70 [88-102].

⁷⁹ The exact date of the fall of Antioch differs in our various sources; the most reliable document is the letter written by Baibars to Bohemond of Tripoli (translated in Michaud-Reinaud, *Bibliothèque des Croisades*, IV [Paris, 1829], pp. 507-11). Baibars says that he left Tripoli on a Wednesday, Shaban 24; he arrived before Antioch at the beginning of the great Ramadan, and captured the city on Saturday, Ramadan 4. These dates correspond to Wednesday, May 9 and Saturday, May 18. (H. G. Cattenoz, *Tables de concordance des ères chrétienne et hégirienne* [Rabat, 1954]). Smpad is correct in stating that the city was taken on a Saturday, but the date—May 6—is wrong, not only because it does not agree with Baibar's letter and with Makrizi, who gives the same dates (ed. Quatremère, I, 2, pp. 52-53), but because May 6 was a Friday not a Saturday. To the sources listed by Runciman, *op. cit.*, p. 326, and Cahen, *op. cit.*, p. 716, we can now add the exact information given by Het'um (Hayton) of Gorigos: Antioch fell on May 17, 1268 (Akopian, *op. cit.*, II, p. 74).

⁸⁰ The Commander of Antioch was the Constable Simon Mansel. He was captured at the head of a small force, but was allowed to return to negotiate for the capitulation of the city (Michaud-Reinaud, *op. cit.*, pp. 508-9; Makrizi, *op. cit.*, p. 52, note 63).

Pp. 250–1 (p. 652), A.D. 1268. Final arrangements for the release of Leon who returns to Cilicia. Appointment of the Catholicos Hagop on February 12, 1268.

Pp. 251–2, A.D. 1269. Severe earthquake. Leon, Baron of the Armenians, goes to visit Khan Abaga and returns with many presents.⁸¹ Smpad's son Het'um dies on July 15 and his other son Vasil on September 29. King Het'um dies on Tuesday, October 29, at sunset.⁸²

P. 252, A.D. 1271. Leon is anointed King on January 6 in the church of Saint Sophia at Tarsus in the presence of a large assembly.

P. 253. "This same year the Sultan of Egypt Baibars Bunduktari set out again to invade Cilicia. And King Leon sent ambassadors to him and made him return to Egypt, while he himself went east, to the Khan Abaga, and the Khan offered him 20,000 men to take back with him for the protection of his land, and he [the Khan] promised to come a few months later. And King Leon, taking a few of these men, returned to his country. This same year a Frank King called King Edward [Eredouard] came by boat with 2,000 men to Acre and waited there for his companions, the other kings."

P. 253–4. In October of the same year, a son is born to Leon. A.D. 1272. Heavy snowfall on January 6th. Death of Güragos *vartabed*. A Muslim woman called Maria plots to poison the King and is apprehended. Leon builds the fortress called Gadariats at the foot of the Taurus mountain. Leon's son is baptized in the presence of the Syrian Catholicos Ignatius, and called T'oros after his uncle.

P. 254. "This same year [1272] one of the servants of King Edward, who had crossed the seas and had come to Acre, one day entered the King's chamber as he was seated alone, clad in a thin garment, and made all the servants go out, and, coming close to the King as if he had a secret to tell, he drew his knife and stabbed him in the chest. The King lept up and put out his right hand to the sword, but the man stabbed him again. . . ." ⁸³

⁸¹ Bar Hebraeus, *op. cit.*, p. 448 dates Leon's visit in the month of July. For other sources see N. Akinian in *Handes Amsorya*, XLII (1948), pp. 269–79.

⁸² The correct date is 1270. Several contemporary notices in Armenian manuscripts record the King's death on Tuesday, October 29, 1270 (see Akinian, *op. cit.*, XLVI [1952], pp. 467–72). Makrizi, however, states that Het'um died in A.H. 669, on the 21st day of Rebi I; this corresponds to November 7, 1270 (*op. cit.*, p. 84). Quatremère adds (Makrizi, *op. cit.*, note 104) that according to Novaïri Baibars received a letter from Leon on the 27th day of Rebi I saying that his father Het'um had died on the 28th of Teschirin I, which corresponds to the 21st of Rebi I.

⁸³ The details given by Smpad, namely, that Edward was dressed in a thin garment, agree with the account of the *Templier de Tyr*, *Gestes des Chiprois*, ed. G. Reynaud, [Geneva, 1887], p. 201, where it is said that Edward was "vestu seulement en chemise et braie." See also R. Röhricht, "La Croisade du Prince Edouard d'Angleterre," *Archives de l'Orient latin*, I (Paris, 1881), pp. 625–7; Michaud-Reinaud, *Bibliothèque des Croisades*, IV, p. 530. Het'um (Hayton) of Gorigos records in his Chronicle that on May 18, 1272 one of the Assassins attempted to kill Prince Edward, and that on September 13th Edward sailed back (Akopian, *op. cit.*, II, p. 76).

ARMENIAN CHRONICLE OF THE CONSTABLE SMPAD 167

The narrative stops abruptly at this point. One folio of the last quire is missing and there was, most probably, an additional quire that has disappeared. The Etchmiadzin manuscripts have an entry for the year 1274, mentioning Baibar's raid as far as Gorigos. Smpad's original text may have continued until 1274 or, at the latest, 1275, since he died in 1276.

The excerpts translated above give a sufficient idea of the significance of the new edition and of the importance of Smpad's Chronicle. Instead of brief notations, with numerous gaps, we now have a continuous and fairly detailed account, the work of a cultured man interested not only in the history of his fatherland, but also in that of the neighboring countries. As Constable of the kingdom and brother of the King he had access to the royal archives and other official documents, and his knowledge of French enabled him to consult contemporary Western sources.

Smpad's broad interests, his use of earlier Armenian writings as well as of Western documents were already evinced by his other works. In 1265 he revised the Law Book, composed in Armenia in 1184 by Mkhitar Gosh, which he summarized, adapted to the usages of his own time, and rewrote in mediaeval Armenian so as to make it more intelligible to his contemporaries.⁸⁴ Before this he had translated parts of the *Assizes of Antioch* for use by the law courts of Cilicia where many usages and customs of the feudal West had been adopted. The original French text is now lost and this mediaeval Code is known to us only through this Armenian translation, which was done with the greatest care from a reliable copy.⁸⁵ In his preface Smpad informs us that the model was sent to him by his close relative Simon, Constable of Antioch, who, in turn, had received it from his father, the late Constable Sire Mansel. "When I completed the translation," adds Smpad, "I sent it again to the Court of Antioch, so that they might confront it [with the original]; and they confirmed in writing and by their testimony that it is correct and agrees [with the original] word for word."⁸⁶

Smpad was also interested in ancient Greek and Byzantine philosophical and theological writings which had been translated into Armenian. A brief note written by him, and preserved in a copy of later date, informs us that he had summarized (or written a commentary on) the *Dialectica* of John Damascene.⁸⁷ He owned the manuscript of the *Scholia* of Cyril of Alexandria and the works of Dionysius the Areopagite, copied in 1175 by Nerses of Lampron,⁸⁸

⁸⁴ Josef Karst, *Armenisches Rechtsbuch, I. Sempadscher Kodex aus dem 13. Jahrhundert oder mittel-armenisches Rechtsbuch* (Strasbourg, 1095). A new edition of this Law Book has recently been published by A. G. Galstian, together with a Russian translation (*Smbat Sparapet. Sudetnik* [Erevan, 1958]). According to Galstian, this Law Book is not a translation or a revision of the text of Mkhitar Gosh, but an original composition based on earlier sources. The similarities between the two works are to be explained by the use, independently of one another, of the same sources.

⁸⁵ Alishan, *Assises d'Antioche* (Venice 1876).

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 2-3.

⁸⁷ Alishan, *Sissouan*, p. 74.

⁸⁸ F. N. Fink and L. Gjandschezian, *Verzeichnis der armenischen Handschriften der königlichen Universitätsbibliothek zu Tübingen* (Tübingen, 1907), p. 111.

and he commissioned a copy of the Categories of Aristotle and the Treatise on the Nature of Man attributed to Gregory of Nyssa, to which he added a fairly long colophon in verse.⁸⁹ Two other manuscripts of his personal library have survived: a Lectionary to which he again wrote a long versified colophon,⁹⁰ and a Gospel book illustrated with full-page miniatures.⁹¹

⁸⁹ Catholicos Garegin I Hovsep'ian, *Colophons of Manuscripts* (in Armenian) (Antilias, 1951), cols. 951–6. The manuscript, begun in 1239, was completed in 1244.

⁹⁰ Vatican, Borgianus armenus 61, A.D. 1268: E. Tisserant, *Codices armeni Bibliothecae Vaticanae* (Rome, 1927), pp. 91, 102. Alishan, *Sissouan*, p. 74.

⁹¹ Erevan, *Matenadaran*, no. 211/7644: G. Hovsep'ian, *op. cit.*, cols. 957–8. For the inscription on one of the churches erected by Smpad, see Alishan, *op. cit.*, pp. 75–6.